



**SHREWSBURY PLANNING BOARD
SHREWSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS**

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: November 3, 2005 - 7:00 P.M.
Location: Selectmen's Hearing Room - Municipal Office Building

Present: Melvin P. Gordon, Chairman
Stephan M. Rodolakis, Vice-Chairman
Jill R. Myers Clerk
Kathleen M. Keohane
Donald F. Naber

Also Present: Eric Denoncourt, Engineer/Planner

Mr. Gordon opened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

1. Review and Approve Minutes:

The Planning Board approved the Minutes of September 1 and September 15, 2005 as submitted.

2. Signed bills.

3. Meetings and Hearings

7:00 P.M. Board Member Comments – no Board Member Comments

**7:05 P.M. Residences at Flint Pond, Senior Housing
Special Permit and Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing, Continued from June 2, 2005
Location: Hartford Pike (Route 20), southeast of Lake Street
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of the hearing**

Attending the hearing was Attorney Kevin Byrne, representing the developers; Roy Smith – the engineer from BSC Group, Benn Sherman – from BSC Group; Dominick Maiellaro RA – from Prellwitz/Chilinski Associates, Inc.; Dave Hawk – from Hawk Design; and Rob Barsamian – the developer.

Attorney Byrne covered the following items:

- 1) submitted a chronology of the project;
- 2) gave status with the ZBA and submitted documentation for this (they will be making a new filing with the ZBA;
- 3) submitted documentation for two more waivers needed from the ZBA.

Attorney Byrne said they are looking for insight from the Planning Board regarding the overall layout of the roadway network and building location, which they would then give to the Engineering Department for them to give more detailed comments regarding the technical aspects of this project.

Mr. Smith submitted the previous site plan overview and the current proposed site plan overview. He also submitted documentation listing other over-55 residential developments going on in Town.

Mr. Smith reviewed some of the changes to the plan:

- 1) there are two multi-unit buildings and the location has changed for both;
- 2) they agreed to hire Judy Barrett, from Community Opportunities Group Inc., as consultant, to review the plan in concept and then to work with her and there have been a number of meetings with her;
- 3) 60% of the units have had locations modified; he explained originally there had been a stipulation that there was a 50-foot setback between the units. He said they know the Board and the Town Meeting approved a new by-law that there could be reduction to a 20-foot setback between the units;
- 4) 55% of the driveways were modified;
- 5) 45% of roadway alignment modified;
- 6) 100% of sidewalks modified.

Mr. Smith said one of Ms. Barrett's suggestions was parking-under the 12-unit buildings. He said they moved the multi-unit buildings to the center front behind the commercial area. He said they are proposing two - 24-unit buildings and therefore they will have four floors because of the under-parking and would have to go to Zoning Board of Appeals. They would have to also go to ZBA for a waiver from the 12-unit building.

Mr. Smith said they want to increase the sidewalk width to six feet and they are asking for a decrease in the pavement width in the roadway system to 24-feet. He reviewed sidewalk locations.

Mr. Smith reviewed the two plans for driveway locations – one with shared driveways and one without shared driveways. He submitted copies of three other senior housing developments plans that are approved and in construction in Shrewsbury for the Board's comparison to their proposed project, mostly to focus on the shared driveways. He reviewed this.

Attorney Byrne said they met with residents at Orchard Meadow to discuss their concerns. He said he also took and submitted pictures of the curb cuts and the garages.

Mr. Smith commented that they are providing six-foot sidewalks in some locations with no grass strip, but they are considering proposing four-foot sidewalks with a two-foot grass strip. He said they are looking for some feedback from the Board.

Mr. Sherman submitted a partial response letter to Judy Barrett's comments and reviewed this letter regarding the following:

- 1) convenient and safe vehicular and pedestrian movements;
- 2) driveway openings that are convenient and safe in relations to the adjacent street network;
- 3) adequate emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Barsamian, OVP Management, made a few comments about the development of the plans. He said they've made a lot of changes, and spent a lot of time redesigning this site. Attorney Byrne reminded the Board and reviewed the substantial offsite work that they will be doing; and said they will probably spend about one million dollars just on the offsite work.

Ms. Keohane made the following comments:

- 1) regarding the width of the sidewalk – would it accommodate two people and a dog walking side by side, or person walking beside wheelchair, or a person with a carriage, etc. Attorney Byrne brought up, as a comparison the other over 55 projects that have four-foot sidewalks. Ms. Keohane commented that just because the Board approved them that way doesn't mean they can't improve on the next project.
- 2) asked if there were any schematic drawings for the 24-unit buildings; Mr. Maiellaro reviewed the look of the buildings;
- 3) asked about the impervious area – what's been gained and what's been lost; Mr. Smith said the senior housing within this zoning district requires 70% open space and they are currently at 74%. He said they used to have surface parking associated with those 36-unit buildings, now they have put that underneath the buildings, so they save that impervious coverage. He said they've also saved it with the pavement cross-section being 24-feet.
- 4) How much of that 74% is in the wetland area? Mr. Sherman thought it was about 14% of the 74%. He said he can provide a breakdown of that.

Mr. Rodolakis expressed concern about the long drive to get to the units at the far end of the development. Mr. Barsamian commented that this is a big project, and one of Ms. Barrett's comments was to get rid of how many road systems they had. He said he also thinks that this is the uniqueness of that area and this will be their highest priced units.

Mr. Rodolakis asked if there was anymore thought as to what the commercial business would be. Mr. Barsamian said they met with some of the neighbors for their input. He said it really depends on what he's hearing from the Board, their direction, how the Board is going to treat Route 20 and the other abutters, when they come up for their projects.

Mr. Barsamian commented that in a few years once they've developed the parkway, they've done their model, done their clubhouse, done their round-about, done the improvement to the road, and hopefully some of the other people will improve their property, he felt they would attract a more attractive tenant that would work with their development program, Orchard Meadow development program, and hopefully bring the level of retail up a little bit, so the other property owners can also follow their lead in trying to get better tenants.

Mr. Gordon listed the following items:

- 1) Asked if this is their final plan? Mr. Barsamian said they believe it is. He asked if this plan could go to Engineering? Mr. Barsamian said it's been in Engineering for two months.
- 2) He commented that the Board asked them almost a year ago to give the Board a zoned-correctly plan.
- 3) Mr. Gordon commented that throughout the process, they mentioned that they had "many other concepts of ways to do things with some of the same numbers," and asked if the Board had seen any of these concepts? He said they never presented to the Board all of those options, because they ended up having a preferred site plan after the informal conversations.
- 4) Said Mr. Barsamian was going to come forward with other examples of other residential projects, besides Settlers' Green in North Conway, NH, that he's done. The Board has not seen this. Mr. Barsamian listed some of the projects and then said he will send a list to Engineering.

- 5) Mr. Gordon asked when they were going to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Attorney Byrne said it's kind of a 'catch-22', stating they started the process with two variances and now after Ms. Barrett's input, they have four. He said that if he's comfortable with this revised plan and the Board can tell Mr. Barsamian that they are comfortable with it, then they can file with ZBA right away on Friday (11/4).
- 6) Mr. Gordon said, from his point of view, he would like to see the phasing plan revised so there are no secrets. He said he'd like to see the building done proportionately – he said he is concerned that this site might be done and gone – 125 units are built because the ZBA says you can't get any more and you have to wait and the commercial never gets built. He said if there is going to be commercial, he would like to see it start at 80 units and go proportionately to the end. He said as he reads the documents from BSC, the plan is to use the commercial area as the stocking area or staging area for the building – junk in front of a building area is not attractive some of the time – he said he'd like it to get to be attractive after half the units or 80 of the units in. He said that may be his recommendation to the Board.
- 7) Mr. Gordon said the parking under buildings #10 and #11 doesn't work. He said there are at least four spaces that are very difficult – somebody buying those spaces is going to have to back out of the whole thing. He said he'd like to have it looked at and maybe put 24 spaces underneath and the other 12 somewhere else so that everybody has the ability to be facing front wards if they want. Mr. Smith said they can take a look at that.
- 8) Mr. Gordon said he would be a vote trying encourage the sidewalks not be four feet. He said although they've approved them, and although everybody has said they are happy with them, he felt a four-foot sidewalk is less then useful. He felt that people can't walk side by side on a four foot sidewalk.
- 9) Mr. Gordon said some of the questions that Engineering had in a letter back in May have not been answered. Mr. Denoncourt said Engineering's concern right now is the overall lay-out. He said he thinks that is something the Board needs to give the applicant input on, and Engineering can go forward with any specific technical comments that still need to be addressed.
- 10) Mr. Gordon said he has other concerns as to whether some of these cul-de-sacs are actually necessary. He said when housing has access to the main roadway and a large cul-de-sac is built, there has to be a good reason to say that's reasonable. Mr. Smith explained the reason for the cul-de-sac use, mostly a topography issue.

Mr. Barsamian also said there are a couple of issues from a land planning standpoint and the marketing standpoint. He said they don't want to see every house one after another, every driveway one after another. Mr. Barsamian said Ms. Barrett was very vocal about it, "please don't put all your houses on the main road so you see all the driveways one after another."

Mr. Barsamian said they have these public areas, these green space areas, that they wanted to take advantage of and they created them. He said they have the topography to play with and they are using it to their advantage – it's harder for them to do. He said it's cheaper to do what Mr. Gordon is saying. Mr. Gordon commented the area where there is a cul-de-sac off the cul-de-sac, looks like it's there just so two more houses could be added.

Mr. Barsamian said they've spent a long time on this plan; they've had a lot of people look at it from a marketing point of view, from an engineering point of view, from a land planning point of view. He respects what is being said, but he believes it does fit and works within the program, not just does each building look great under a certain design, but in the overall program of what they are trying to sell and who they are marketing it to.

Sue Mann, 5 Cortland Grove Drive, commented that she thinks that one of the words Mr. Barsamian is looking for to describe the plan is "charm."

John Collins, 12 Cider Mill Drive, who came in late, asked how many high-rises and where are they located? Mr. Barsamian said they have moved them to the middle, front of the site. Mr. Collins said placement of these high-rises was one of his concerns and commented that the new proposed location was wonderful.

Beverly Materese, 14 Cider Mill Drive, commented that they could have six-foot sidewalks, because the grass gets ruined by salt anyway.

Christopher Kirk, 40 Westwood Drive, asked the following:

- 1) how many variances and what they are. Attorney Byrne listed them from him.
- 2) would the project include affordable housing (since Town Meeting). Mr. Barsamian said no.
- 3) is there any vehicular access to the residential area through the commercial plaza that is going to be built. Mr. Barsamian showed this area.
- 4) is there provision for residential units over the commercial building; Mr. Barsamian said not at this time.
- 5) elevations available for the commercial buildings? Mr. Smith said not at this time.
- 6) asked if there will be provision to ensure the proponent finishes the project (similar to the Ternberry Subdivision). Mr. Gordon said there will be bonding, and also that is part of the reason that he thinks that the commercial should be, after a point, built proportionately with the rest of the development.

Mr. Gordon said the Town and most of the State is under a mandate to re-charge and asked if that was going to be done. Mr. Smith said as part of the Conservation Commission filing, they submitted a full drainage report, and also for this filing there is one filed. He said as part of the Massachusetts Stormwater Management guidelines, there is an infiltration requirement and they meet or exceed that with this development program.

Mr. Gordon commented that he was surprised that in the roadway from Lake Street up to the round-about, there isn't a thicker pavement, where commercial vehicles will be running over it. Mr. Smith said they would take a look at the life expectancy of that pavement due to the traffic.

Mr. Gordon asked if the number of wetland crossings had been reduced. Mr. Smith said they don't have any wetland crossings. Mr. Sherman said they are not proposing any as part of the roadway, but at the request of the Fire Chief about providing a looping system for the water, they are crossing in one area. He said what they are working out with the Conservation Commission, right now, is the permanent disturbance as a result of that waterline, is being mitigated by the fact that they are restoring a portion of wetlands that has been degraded by the ATV's that have worked their way through the site, in addition to the area of debris that has been dumped there over time. Mr. Smith said their restoration is 4:1.

Mr. Gordon asked about the Grafton Fire Department's request regarding emergency access. Attorney Byrne said he had a conversation with the developer of that area, who wasn't interested in talking to him, and that developer in Grafton wasn't interested in doing whatever it was their ZBA wanted them to do.

Mr. Rodolakis asked if they have filed for their sewer extension permit. Mr. Smith said not yet, they have their MEPA certificate. He said what they wanted to do was fine tune their plan because a part of that submission, they need to do the plans and profiles which is part of this submission that is in front of the Planning Board.

Mr. Rodolakis asked about the ENF. Mr. Smith said they filed a Notice of Project Change and got a certificate from the Secretary.

Mr. Gordon verified that this September 20, 2005 plan was their final plan; Mr. Smith said yes and the drainage report. Mr. Gordon also commented that it is helpful to the Board that if information can be given before the meeting so they will have time to review it before the meeting.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 5, 2006, at 7:05 P.M.

**7:10 P.M. Palm Meadow Estates, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing, continued from July 7, 2005
Location: Clews Street, east of Route 140
Decision Deadline: November 10, 2005**

Mr. Gordon read a letter dated November 1, 2005, from Dunn McKenzie asking for a continuance and giving an extension for the Board's decision to December 15, 2005. The Board voted to allow continuance to December 8, 2005, at 7:10 P.M.

**7:15 P.M. Memorial Drive, Business Park, Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing, Continued from August 4, 2005
Location: east side of Memorial Drive, south of Hyde Farm Road
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of the hearing**

Mr. Gordon read a letter dated November 1, 2005, from RIFL Realty Trust asking for a continuance. The Board voted to allow continuance to December 8, 2005, at 7:15 P.M.

**7:20 P.M. Village at Orchard Meadows, Senior Housing
Special Permit for Multi-Family, Senior Housing
Public Hearing
Location: Grafton Street and Purinton Street
Decision Deadline: 90 days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing was Joe Farrell – the developer. Mr. Farrell said he is at the hearing to request that the Board grant a Special Permit for a multi-family, townhouse senior housing development known as Village at Orchard Meadows. He said the development has been designed in compliance with the zoning by-law requirements. He stated that this project was originally voted on and approved in 2000/2001.

Mr. Farrell said at that time there was an oversight on the part of the Planning Board, himself, and everybody involved in the project, everybody who had reviewed the project – he went through an entire Site Plan Approval process, but it was never specified within the hearings that it was both a Site Plan and Special Permit application. He said he came in again last month, for a modification to the Site Plan, at which the hearing was held and they went through that process.

At that time, Mr. Denoncourt noticed that it was advertised again as a Site Plan Modification without reference to a Special Permit. He said it was agreed at that meeting that he would come back, re-advertise for the entire project listing it as a Special Permit Application.

Kevin O'Reilly, 57 Purinton Street, expressed concern for the condition of Purinton Street. He said work was done to Purinton Street, but the paving was never finished and this will be the third winter that they go into with the road getting progressively in worse shape and detrimental to the traffic passing on it. Mr. Gordon said Mr. Denoncourt will take note for the Engineering Department.

Mr. Farrell explained that part of the initial approval agreement was that he would install the sewers, improve the roadway (widening it where necessary), do the work at the interchange of Route 20 and Purinton Street, along with some drainage modifications, etc., with the Town being responsible for the top pavement for both Purinton Street and Grafton Street.

Mr. Gordon officially closed the hearing. The Board voted to approve the Special Permit and Site Plan and to authorize Ms. Myers to sign the Decision as written, and the Board to sign in poll – Mr. Naber – in favor, Ms. Keohane – in favor, Mr. Rodolakis – in favor, Ms. Myers – in favor, and Mr. Gordon – in favor.

**7:35 P.M. 101 N. Quinsigamond Avenue, Three Unit Multi-family
Special Permit and Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing was Dean Handley – the developer, and Kevin Quinn – the engineer from Quinn Engineering. Mr. Gordon read the comment letter from the Police Chief and the Board of Health, and the e-mail correspondence from the Fire Chief.

Mr. Quinn said after much discussion between the Board, the Building Inspector, and Engineering, it was decided that they should be filing a Special Permit (for the multi-family). He said they are asking the Board to credit his client the fee which we had paid for the Special Permit for the Common Drive or the Special Permit for the multi-family, because they withdrew the Common Drive Special Permit application. The Board agreed to credit the fee as requested.

Mr. Quinn said they are asking significant zoning relief on this project; but they have not applied for that zoning relief. He said his client's counsel is going to file the relief based on input from this meeting. He said they are seeking relief for a number of items as follows:

- 1) Front Yard Setback
- 2) Side Yard Setback for two buildings
- 3) Parking on the front yard and side yard setback
- 4) Driveway isle width
- 5) 50 foot separation between the buildings

Mr. Quinn said they have designed a drainage system which accommodates the Stormwater Management requirements. Mr. Quinn said he can meet and address Engineering's comments.

Mr. Naber commented that in looking at this project, there is a lot that's needed to get this moving in the right direction for them, with the variances that are needed with the setbacks.

Mr. Naber said it looks like if it's taken from 3 to 2 buildings, there is a lot more to work with to alleviate some of the issues from the variance standpoint. He asked if that was something that can be considered. Mr. Handley said it currently has three buildings on it – one has fallen down and two are there.

Mr. Handley said when he bought the property, the site plan that was approved was for a single building, 30 feet wide, 100 feet long, and four stories high. He said he was ready to pick up where that left off, but the Building Inspector and others said that wasn't particularly attractive, and would he consider something different. He said there is a cost effectiveness equation, and he said if it's not feasible with two, he would retreat back to the original plan that was available 2-1/2 years ago, which he finds unattractive too.

Mr. Handley said part of the difficulty in the land is that it's long and narrow and it's steep in grade; and said the two buildings that exist there now, if he just rebuilt them, they would be in desperate position – they wouldn't be serviced by fire truck or any other emergency vehicles. He said he hoped there would be kind of a give and take on the attractiveness and appeal and try to maintain the number of variances low, but this property is so prohibitively difficult.

Ms. Keohane said regarding drainage, she is concerned about the swale going down along the property line and how the water is actually going to get to that swale and what can be done to buffer any neighbors. Mr. Quinn said the active portion of the swale is about five feet, but there are some portions beyond it. He said there is a retaining wall, so the neighbors are really not going to be confronted by a swale in their backyard. Mr. Handley said the retaining wall is about 5-1/2 to 6 feet.

Ms. Keohane asked about the foundation drains that are coming off the first two houses from the street, how is that going to get to the swale? Mr. Quinn said they don't anticipate a lot of groundwater to be on this site primarily because it's steeply sloped toward the lake. He said he would not anticipate a barrage of groundwater. He said they need to put in drains if it does occur but it would probably occur like the recent very rains of a couple of weeks ago.

Ms. Keohane asked Mr. Denoncourt if that was going to work out alright? Mr. Denoncourt said he questioned that in his comments. Mr. Quinn said they would have no problem linking them and carrying them down closer to the lake.

Mr. Rodolakis asked about the width of the driveway regarding emergency vehicles, commenting it seems kind of tight. Mr. Quinn said they provided a 20-foot wide access way through there; the common drive requirement would be for 18-feet.

Mr. Quinn said this drive is not a common drive; it's classified as a parking lot, so they need to provide a 24-foot wide aisle. He said for residential use, their thinking that a 24-foot wide driveway is kind of big for three homes. He said that is subject to the variance request they have to seek relief on.

Mr. Rodolakis asked other than the swale that Ms. Keohane identified and couple of foundation drains, if that's the extent of drainage on the site. Mr. Quinn said they have a catch basin with the stormwater treatment unit, so they meet the removal of suspended solids requirement, and then they put it into a swale which operates as an infiltration unit and it also breaks the flow up, and what they are really trying to accomplish is to break down the velocity so they don't have erosive water passing.

Mr. Gordon asked the following:

- 1) There are two dry-wells; are these the only two dry-wells on the property? Mr. Quinn said Engineering asked about this. He said the two dry-wells accommodate the recharge standard.
- 2) Do they feel that one stormceptor is enough on this property, even though the one meets the rule of law? Mr. Quinn said he does because they do have a fairly limited area of asphalt that they are collecting run-off from, and roof water is classified as clean water. He said it's the dirty water that they need to get the suspended solids out of as collected off the paved surfaces, and the unit as specified as designed to remove 80% of the suspended solids, is in accordance with the State's methodology.
- 3) Do you think that a swale is the proper thing or maybe a grassed gully or something similar would be better? Mr. Gordon commented that swales are not good looking. Mr. Quinn said there are a number of technical reasons why they work for them on this site. He said what they don't want to do is put a detention area in there, they need to accomplish that detention function somehow, and a swale like this does help them do that. Mr. Gordon asked Mr. Denoncourt if there was something else that could do that, and Mr. Denoncourt said it's possible to do some type of underground storage. He said in terms of the swale itself, a grass lined swale issue there is because of the slope, the velocity can't be controlled, so they need the stone in there to maintain the flow. Mr. Gordon expressed concern about the one house that has it next to it and it is the one house that they are going to try and get the most money for, so he's trying to improve their view.

Mr. Quinn said they could bring the culvert beyond the house, so there isn't a swale beside the building and flare it out. Mr. Gordon asked if that would be economically feasible; and Mr. Quinn said yes.

- 4) Mr. Gordon asked, with the size of these buildings, if they were going to be sprinklered? Mr. Quinn said he wasn't able to answer that, but with the buildings this size, he thought they would be. Mr. Gordon said because of the Fire Chief's comment, they should consider it.
- 5) snow storage – where is it? Mr. Quinn said there are three snow storage areas and showed the areas. Mr. Gordon asked if that was adequate, and Mr. Quinn said that's substantially more than 5% of the paved area.
- 6) Mr. Gordon said his concern is that an emergency vehicle would have to back out the whole way; and if somebody's parked in their space in the middle of the night, there is 8% grade and there is a guy backing out – is it the best that can be done? Mr. Quinn said they can modify that.

Mr. Gordon asked if they were requesting any waivers from the Board. Mr. Quinn said the only waiver that he thinks they were concerned about was the width of the parking area, and he believes that is a ZBA relief.

Mr. Denoncourt commented with reference to the sprinklering of the buildings, minimum separation between multi-family buildings is fifty-feet. He said when buildings are sprinklered, they are allowed to reduce that to twenty-feet. He said they are at ten-feet for one of the buildings, so they would need a variance and the buildings that are twenty-feet, those would have to be sprinklered or they would need a variance.

Emily Eaton, 25 Eaglehead Terrace, asked if there are currently any trees between where those buildings are and Eaglehead Cove, and if there were plans to put any trees between.

Mr. Quinn said they don't show that on their plan. Ms. Eaton basically expressed that she would like to see some type of buffer using trees.

Anne Zettek-Sumner, 99 North Quinsigamond Avenue, listed the following:

- 1) would like to make adjustments for electric light pole location;
- 2) get copy of plans?
- 3) water drain concern – commented that there is an amazing amount of water that comes from the other side of North Quinsigamond Avenue because it comes from the hill, so she hopes that the Planning Board is going to help them out in taking a look at what goes into the lake and what's going to go on her property. Mr. Quinn said generally run-off comes across the site toward the Zettek-Sumner property. He said this roadway will operate to intercept and carry water away that goes in the direction of her property currently, and direct it toward the project's collection system, so a lot of the run-off that she may be living with now will be relieved. There was further discussion about this.

Mr. Gordon said because they have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, would there be consideration to continue to January. Mr. Quinn asked for the meeting to be continued to the January 5th meeting. Mr. Gordon continued the meeting to January 5, 2006, at 7:10 P.M.

4. New Business

a. Review and Approve Bond for Hickory Hill Estates

The Board voted to accept the Bond amounts for Hickory Hill Estates.

b. Covenant Release for Hickory Hill Estates

The Board voted to sign and have Engineering hold for Bond submittal and approval as to form.

c. Review 2006 Meeting Schedule

The Board noted receipt of the 2006 meeting schedule and they will review for discussion and approval at the December 8, 2005 meeting.

5. Old Business

a. Discussed and Signed Decision for Russell Industrial Park, Preliminary Subdivision

The Board voted to authorize the Clerk, Ms. Myers, to sign the Decision for Russell Industrial Park, Preliminary Subdivision, as written.

b. Discussed and Signed Decision for Village at Orchard Meadows

The Board voted to sign the Decision for Village at Orchard Meadows Special Permit, as drafted.

c. Discussed and Signed Decision for Glendale Avenue, Preliminary Subdivision

The Board voted to authorize the Clerk, Ms. Myers, to sign the Decision for Glendale Avenue, Preliminary Subdivision, as written.

d. Discussed and Signed Decision for CCX Service Center – Conway Transportation

Mr. Rodolakis abstained from discussions and voting, due to possible conflict of interest. The Board voted to authorize the Clerk, Ms. Myers, to sign the Decision for CCX Service Center, as written.

6. Correspondence

a) Brochure on the Transfer and Development Rights

The Board noted receipt of information. Mr. Denoncourt commented that it's an excellent planning tool that deserves some consideration. Mr. Gordon said when there are seminars on it, he asked Mr. Denoncourt to let the Board know.

b) November 3, 2005 – 57 Francis Avenue Special Permit – 20-day appeal period has elapsed with no complaints

7. Miscellaneous

a) Stonybrook Guardrail

Mr. Gordon said Mr. Perreault has not met with the Engineer, so he suggests that the Board wait for them to meet and get Mr. Perreault's comments, and therefore hold until the December meeting.

b) Boston Hill

Mr. Gordon said they did receive some correspondence that there may be some apparent activity, and there should be some update fairly soon.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Annette W. Rebovich